

REMARKS

Claims 1-21, all the claims pending in the application, stand rejected on prior art grounds.

Claim 8 stands rejected upon informalities. In addition, the drawings are objected to.

Applicants respectfully traverse these objections/rejections based on the following discussion.

I. The 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph, Rejection

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claim 8 has been amended to change "server" to "servers" in order to correct the antecedent basis error. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

II. The Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1-2, 4, 6 and 8-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' Admitted Prior Art, in view of Salazar (U.S. Patent No. 6,073,141). Claims 12 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' Admitted Prior Art, in view of Foladare, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,905,777), hereinafter referred to as Foladare. Claims 3, 5, 13 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' Admitted Prior Art, in view of Foladare, and in further view of Vaudreuil (U.S. Patent No. 5,872,779). Claims 7 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being

10/037,425

unpatentable over Applicants' Admitted Prior Art, in view of Salazar and Foladare, and in further view of Barzegar, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,894,478), hereinafter referred to as Barzegar. Claims 14-16 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' Admitted Prior Art, in view of Foladare, and in further view of Salazar. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the following discussion.

A. The Rejection Based on Admitted Prior Art and Salazar

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because Salazar is limited to a system that synchronizes database records, such as address books, and Salazar does not teach or suggest adding additional hierarchy to the addressing schemes of different agencies to provide communication between users in the different agencies, without changing either agency's addressing scheme, as defined by Applicants' independent claims. Therefore, as discussed in greater detail below, it is Applicants' position that the independent claims are not taught or suggested by the combination of the admitted prior art and Salazar.

More specifically, independent claims 1 and 8 define that the "central processing unit is adapted to add additional hierarchy (regional address in claim 8) to said first addressing scheme and said second addressing scheme to provide communication between users in said first agency and users in said second agency, without changing said first addressing scheme or said second addressing scheme". As explained in paragraph [0024] of the application when messages are transmitted between different units within a given system, the messages are unaltered and operate

10/037,425

according to that system's requirements. However, when messages are transmitted through the regional message server to a unit in a different agency, additional information is added to the original message by the regional message server that identifies the agency to which the message is directed. Further, the invention does not alter messages that are originated and delivered within a given agency. Thus, the invention does not require modification of the existing architecture of any given agency. Instead, the invention provides an additional communication channel that allows messages to be transferred easily and quickly between agencies. The only additional information required to transmit a message to a different agency is the proper regional address to identify the unit in the different agency (see paragraph [0025]).

In the example shown in Applicants' Figure 3, unit 1121 (301) in agency A sends a message to unit M351 in Agency B. The message could include unit-to-unit, unit-to-host, host-to-unit, and host-to-group addresses. Initially, the message 303 has a sending identification (\$UNIT) of "1211" and a destination identification of "m351@agencyb.metro1.us" in which "m351" identifies the recipient unit, "Agency B" identifies the destination Agency B, "metro 1" identifies the Metropolitan ExWIN server 310, and "us" represents the recipient country "United States." The Agency A message switch 304 forwards the message 305 to the server that is in the "us" (the United States) national system and corresponds to "metro1" (e.g., the ExWIN server 310). The ExWIN server 310 uses the global directory 308 to convert the message address 311 to an address acceptable to Local Agency "B" Message Switch 312, and to show that the sender is "1121@agencya.metro1.us," which allows the recipient to know which agency and unit sent the message. The message 311 is then forwarded to the Agency B server 312, which forwards

10/037,425

the message to the appropriate unit "M351" 302. As shown in Figure 3, the two agencies presently have an existing mobile data system in place.

These systems were designed to allow officers within each respective agency to send and receive messages among local agency units and the local host (CAD) system. As mentioned above, each agency chooses the method by which they want to address their units. Agency address plans typically reflect their method of operation. Some agencies use officer badge numbers, some use unit numbers assigned to vehicles, some may use beat plan representations, and others may simply choose arbitrary numbers. The global directory 308 provides a way for existing agencies to continue using their existing addressing schemes for local users, yet still participate in the network (see Specification paragraphs [0031]-[0033]).

It is Applicant's position that Salazar does not teach or suggest these features and instead is limited to a system that automatically updates an electronic address book without requiring substantial user intervention (column 1, lines 1-30; column 2, line 66-column 3, line 19).

Therefore, Applicants submit that Salazar does not teach or suggest that the "central processing unit is adapted to add additional hierarchy (regional address in claim 8) to said first addressing scheme and said second addressing scheme to provide communication between users in said first agency and users in said second agency, without changing said first addressing scheme or said second addressing scheme" as defined by independent claims 1 and 8. Therefore, it is Applicant's position that independent claims 1 and 8 are patentable over the proposed combination of the admitted prior art and Salazar. Further, dependent claims 2, 4, 6, and 9-11 are similarly patentable, not only because they depend from a patentable independent claim, but

10/037,425

also because of the additional features they define. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

B. The Rejection Based on Admitted Prior Art and Foladare

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because Foladare is limited to a system that transmits e-mail messages over an e-mail of network, and Foladare does not teach or suggest adding additional hierarchy to the addressing schemes of different agencies to provide communication between users in the different agencies, without changing either agency's addressing scheme, as defined by Applicants' independent claims. Therefore, as discussed in greater detail below, it is Applicants' position that the independent claims are not taught or suggested by the combination of the admitted prior art and Foladare.

More specifically, independent claims 12 and 17 define an altering process that "adds additional hierarchy to said first addressing scheme and said second addressing scheme to provide communication between users in said first agency and users in said second agency, without changing said first addressing scheme or said second addressing scheme". As explained in paragraph [0024] of the application, when messages are transmitted between different units within a given system, the messages are unaltered and operate according to that system's requirements. However, when messages are transmitted through the regional message server to a unit in a different agency, additional information is added to the original message by the regional message server that identifies the agency to which the message is directed. Further, the invention

10/037,425

does not alter messages that are originated and delivered within a given agency. Thus, the invention does not require modification of the existing architecture of any given agency. Instead, the invention provides an additional communication channel that allows messages to be transferred easily and quickly between agencies. The only additional information required to transmit a message to a different agency is the proper regional address to identify the unit in the different agency (see paragraph [0025]).

It is Applicant's position that Foladare does not teach or suggest these features and instead is limited to a system where e-mails are routed to an e-mail server and useful e-mail messages are identified, separated from the junk mail, and forwarded as directed by the recipient. The e-mail server sends a summary of the e-mail message to the recipient over a different network so that the recipient can select a forwarding destination for the message. The e-mail message can be forwarded by the server over another network, such as the public telephone network, to a computer or a FAX machine at the recipient's office, home or other destination (Col. 1, lines 57-67). There is nothing within this system which describes the ability to include additional hierarchy to the addressing schemes of different agencies to provide communication between users in the different agencies, without changing either agency's addressing scheme.

Therefore, Applicants submit that Foladare does not teach or suggest an altering process that "adds additional hierarchy to said first addressing scheme and said second addressing scheme to provide communication between users in said first agency and users in said second agency, without changing said first addressing scheme or said second addressing scheme" as defined by independent claims 12 and 17. Therefore, it is Applicant's position that independent

10/037,425

claims 12 and 17 are patentable over the proposed combination of the admitted prior art and Foladare. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

C. The Rejection Based on Admitted Prior Art, Foladare, and Vaudreuil

The previously discussed distinctions between the claimed invention and the admitted prior art and Foladare are incorporated herein by reference and not repeated. The additional reference Vaudreuil discloses a communication system that operates to integrate and interconnect disparate sources and technologies of communication traffic and to translate messages between them. The communication system maintains a universal database of all users of the communication system and their individual communication profiles including various media in which the users can send and receive messages (column. 4, line 62-column 5, line 2).

However, Vaudreuil is different than the claimed invention which adds additional hierarchy to the addressing schemes of different agencies to provide communication between users in the different agencies, without changing either agency's addressing scheme. In Vaudreuil rather than adding an additional hierarchy, Vaudreuil utilizes many different types of translators that can translate the type of media, protocol, language, etc (column 5, lines 15-19 and column 6, lines 1-5)). Such translators are substantially more complicated and more error prone than the claimed methodology. For example, such translators must anticipate and have full knowledge of all current protocols; however, such protocols rapidly change and translators can

10/037,425

quickly become outdated. Further, translation operations are often complicated, cumbersome, and time-consuming as can be seen with the translation process discussed and column 22, lines 19-30 of Vaudreuil. To the contrary, as explained in paragraph [0024] of Applicants' specification, the claimed regional message server utilizes an addressing scheme based upon a hierarchical scheme. This permits each individual system's address scheme to remain intact, without modification. Thus, by avoiding using translators, the claimed invention is substantially more workable, more flexible, faster, and less expensive than the systems described in Vaudreuil.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that Vaudreuil does not teach or suggest that the "central processing unit is adapted to add additional hierarchy to said first addressing scheme and said second addressing scheme to provide communication between users in said first agency and users in said second agency, without changing said first addressing scheme or said second addressing scheme" as defined by independent claim 1, or an altering process that "adds additional hierarchy to said first addressing scheme and said second addressing scheme to provide communication between users in said first agency and users in said second agency, without changing said first addressing scheme or said second addressing scheme" as defined by independent claims 12 and 17. Therefore, it is Applicant's position that independent claims 1, 12, and 17 are patentable over the proposed combination of the admitted prior art, Foladare, and Vaudreuil. Further, dependent claims 3, 5, 13, and 18 are similarly patentable, not only because they depend from a patentable independent claims, but also because of the additional features of the invention they define. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

10/037,425

D. The Rejection Based on Admitted Prior Art, Foladare, Vaudreuil, and Barzegar

The previously discussed distinctions between the claimed invention and the admitted prior art, Foladare, and Vaudreuil are incorporated herein by reference and not repeated. The additional reference Barzegar is referenced for the limited purpose of teaching that a mobile phone database holds the user profile for every active mobile user (column 4, lines 64-66). However, Barzegar is not reference for teaching (and does not teach) adding additional hierarchy to the addressing schemes of different agencies to provide communication between users in the different agencies, without changing either agency's addressing scheme. Therefore, even if Barzegar would have been combined with the admitted prior art, Foladare, and Vaudreuil, the proposed combination would not teach or suggest the invention defined by independent claims 1 and 17. More specifically, none of the prior art of record teaches or suggests suggest that the "central processing unit is adapted to add additional hierarchy to said first addressing scheme and said second addressing scheme to provide communication between users in said first agency and users in said second agency, without changing said first addressing scheme or said second addressing scheme" as defined by independent claim 1, or an altering process that "adds additional hierarchy to said first addressing scheme and said second addressing scheme to provide communication between users in said first agency and users in said second agency, without changing said first addressing scheme or said second addressing scheme" as defined by independent claim 17. Therefore, it is Applicant's position that independent claims 1 and 17 are

10/037,425

patentable over the proposed combination of the admitted prior art, Foladare, Vaudreuil, and Barzegar. Further, dependent claims 7 and 21 are similarly patentable, not only because they depend from a patentable independent claim, but also because of the additional features of the invention they define. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

E. The Rejection Based on Admitted Prior Art, Foladare, and Salazar

The previously discussed distinctions between the claimed invention and the admitted prior art, Foladare, and Salazar are incorporated herein by reference and not repeated. As shown above, it is Applicant's position that independent claims 12 and 17 are patentable over the admitted prior art, Foladare, and Salazar and any combination thereof. Further, dependent claims 14-16 and 19-20 are similarly patentable, not only because they depend from a patentable independent claim, but also because of the additional features of the invention they define. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

III. Formal Matters and Conclusion

With respect to the objection to the drawings, Replacement Sheets are submitted herewith. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and

10/037,425